



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Writing to Joseph Priestly in 1780 about the progress of physical science, he said :

"Oh, that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement, that men would cease to be wolves to one another, and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity!"

Writing to Priestly again the same year, he gave utterance to the following oft-quoted words:

"In what light we are viewed by superior beings may be gathered from a piece of late West India news which possibly has not yet reached you. A young angel of distinction being sent down to this world on some business, for the first time, had an old courier-spirit assigned him as a guide. They arrived over the seas of Martinico in the middle of the long day of obstinate fight between the fleets of Rodney and De Grasse. When through the clouds of smoke he saw the fire of the guns, the decks covered with mangled limbs and bodies dead or dying, the ships sinking, burning or blown into the air, and the quantity of pain, misery and destruction the crews yet alive were thus with so much eagerness dealing round to one another, he turned angrily to his guide and said: 'You blundering blockhead, you are ignorant of your business; you undertook to conduct me to the earth, and you have brought me into hell!' 'No, sir,' says the guide, 'I have made no mistake; this is really the earth, and these are men. Devils never treat one another in this cruel manner; they have more sense and more of what men (vainly) call humanity.'"

Not only did Franklin deeply deplore the Revolutionary War, but later the wars in Europe troubled him very much. "I lament with you the prospect of a horrid war, which is likely to engage so great a part of mankind," he wrote to John Ingenhousz in 1788; and he proceeded at considerable length to set forth what he thought common sense would dictate in regard to the controversies. Later in the year, in another letter to Mr. Ingenhousz, he said:

"I grieve at the wars Europe is engaged in, and wish they were ended; for I fear even the victors will be losers."

Not only did Franklin deplore war in particular and in general, but he also urged such improvements in international law as would make it more infrequent and less horrible when it did occur. He pleaded for the principle and practice of arbitration, for the neutrality of commerce, for the abandonment of privateering, for the neutralization of colonies, for the faithful observance of treaties, for the abolition of the duel, etc.

In order to appreciate at their full worth these opinions of Franklin, it must be remembered that they were held and frankly expressed at a time when war was nearly universal and was considered by almost everybody not only lawful in serious emergencies, but even great and glorious as a business. It was a whole generation before anybody thought of creating a peace

society and making organized effort to abolish the cruel and inhuman system of war. Franklin's anti-militarism was deeper and stronger than that of Washington, and, of the few public men who a little later shared his views, only Thomas Jefferson and John Jay can be said to have fathomed as fully as he the irrationality and essential inhumanity of war.

Editorial Notes.

Armaments and Peace.

It has often been asserted by the most thoughtful among the advocates of peace that the feverish rivalry of armaments which has been going on for about a generation constitutes a serious danger of international complications and of war. This has just as often been denied by the supporters of militarism, who have asserted that these armaments are a form of insurance against war. Now comes the new British Premier, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, a responsible statesman of the first order, and gives in almost the identical words used by advocates of peace, a fresh warning of the dangers of these overgrown establishments. In his first public address, after taking the reins of government, he expressed himself on this subject in the following terse way: "The growth of armaments is a great danger to the peace of the world. *The policy of huge armaments keeps alive, stimulates and feeds the belief that force is the best if not the only solution of international difficulties.*" The words which we have italicized lay the weight of emphasis on a reason which has not usually been made so prominent by the *pacifistes*. Their argument has been twofold: The great armaments create an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust among the nations, which leads to the exaggeration of incidents which are often of no importance in themselves, and in this way grave misunderstandings are produced. Then, again, those whose profession it is to manage these great armaments are naturally inclined to wish to "magnify their calling" by some practical demonstration of their own capacity and the efficiency of the forces and implements under their charge. They become thus directly or indirectly lobbyists for war whenever a cloud presents itself on the horizon. It would be easy to give notable illustrations of the working of both these principles. When you have added the reason emphasized by the British Premier, you have an indictment of the system of armaments which it would seem ought to turn every thoughtful, well-meaning man into an advocate of their abolition.

Great Britain and Germany.

The *Herald of Peace* reports the meeting held in Caxton Hall, Westminster, on the 1st of December, to promote friendly relations between Great Britain and Germany, to have

been most successful. Addresses were made by Lord Avebury, Leonard Courtney, Sir John Kennaway, M. P., Lord Stanmore, Sir Michael Foster, M. P., and others. The burden of these speeches was that "any one who attempted to sow dissensions between these two great countries was guilty of a serious crime, and an enemy of both." Letters of sympathy were received from a number of prominent persons, including the German Ambassador and the Archbishops of Canterbury and Westminster. The meeting, after appointing a committee to continue the work, adopted the following address to the public, which is being widely circulated:

"Feeling strongly the importance of maintaining peaceful and friendly relations between the British and German nations, we desire to express the firm conviction that there is no good ground, either in economic or political circumstances, for any unfriendly policy between the two nations. The perpetual increase of armaments in Europe is deplorable, and has led to the imposition of heavy burdens upon both peoples. To arrest this insane rivalry is to the interest of both. Incidents trifling in themselves have been misrepresented, injudicious or malicious statements have been repeated, and trifles have been magnified, until in some quarters a feeling of irritation has been created, and the possibility of war has even been discussed. We emphatically protest against the mere thought of such conflict as a folly and a crime. We know of no possible ground of serious quarrel between the two countries. On the contrary, we find in their history, their common faith and long friendship, their mutual indebtedness in literature, science and art, the strongest reasons for the maintenance of cordial and friendly relations. We therefore appeal to citizens of both countries to join us by word and action in the great work of making this better feeling effective in their daily life and public policy."

This movement to counteract the growing irritation between the two countries did not begin a moment too soon. We hope that it has begun in time to prevent even the beginning of the enormous mischief which was evidently brewing, for feeling in both countries was getting into a very bad way, and bad feeling is a great inventor of slights and insults and wrongs where none whatever exist.

What the Pacific Coast Needs. The following editorial reflections in *Leslie's Weekly* on the desire of Pacific coast people for a largely increased fleet of war vessels in Pacific waters come as near to the exact truth of the case as could well be:

"Some of the Pacific coast papers have been congratulating themselves on the announced determination of the government to add largely to the fleet of war ships in Pacific waters and to the coast-defense works, of which, we are told, there is 'a great and pressing need.' Without any intention of criticising the administration of the war and navy departments, it is pertinent to

remark that we could easily name at least a score of things which the Pacific coast needs for its material development and the welfare of its people much more than it needs additional forts and war ships. What pressing necessity exists for a larger defensive equipment in that part of the country is more than we can imagine. The natives of Kamchatka are not meditating a descent upon Oregon or California, so far as we know; neither have we had any intimations that the extensive navy of the Soloman Islanders has been furbished up with a view to raiding our western shores. If not these, then where is the enemy against whose nefarious designs we are called to prepare ourselves to the tune of several millions of dollars? In his recent Thanksgiving Proclamation President Roosevelt said, 'We are not threatened by foes from without,' and surely no one understands the situation better than our Chief Executive. There is not, in truth, the slightest reason why a vast sum of public money should be expended in further defense preparations on the Pacific coast, or any other American coast, for that matter. Millions of public funds have been squandered in the past few years on gun rests, dynamite cruisers, big cannon, and other pieces of war enginery that are now in the junk yard. The cost of a single new battleship or an extensive land fortification would go far toward providing the Pacific coast with better harbor facilities, thus meeting an actual necessity which the expanding commerce of that quarter of the Union has created, and adding something of real and enduring value to the whole country."

If our Pacific coast friends, protected by the widest of the oceans, would only do a little more silent and patient thinking about their real situation before clamoring for more protection by war vessels, they would see the ludicrousness of the scarecrows and nightmares with which they afflict their busy imaginations.

Sir Edward Thornton, who died in London on the 26th of January, was famous in his day as an arbitrator. He entered the diplomatic service in 1842 and became envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the United States in 1867. During his residence at Washington he acted as arbitrator in a number of important controversies. In 1868 the governments of the United States and Mexico chose him as referee in the Pious Fund case. He rendered his decision in 1875 in favor of the California claimants. It was on the basis of his award that the Hague Court, to which this dispute was finally referred in 1902, declared it to be a case coming under the principle of *res judicata*, and on that ground decided in favor of the United States. In 1870 he acted as arbitrator in the case of the United States whaling ship *Canada*, in a claim against Brazil for damages for the wreck of the vessel while within the jurisdiction of Brazil. In 1871 he was appointed a member of the joint high commission chosen to consider the various questions affecting the relations between the United States and

Great Britain, and took part in the famous Alabama arbitration. In 1873 he was appointed, conjointly with Mr. Archibald, as agent to pay over to the United States the amount of the Alabama award.

Anglo-German Conciliation. The Committee of the German Peace Society has, during the month of January, had organized throughout Germany a series of public meetings in favor of an Anglo-German *rapprochement*. Not only the peace societies, but other organizations and groups of persons in sympathy with the movement, have taken part in these manifestations, some of which have been very large and enthusiastic. The following resolution, or one of like import, has been voted in the meetings:

"We welcome with deep satisfaction the steps which have been taken by competent persons on both sides of the channel with the view of putting an end to the tension at present existing between the two countries. We consider the feelings aroused by a disloyal press a danger artificially created which is of a nature to disturb the peace between the peoples; and we are persuaded that the German nation cherishes as little sentiment of animosity towards the English people as the latter towards Germany. We desire that the two peoples, which have a common origin and are in many respects dependent upon each other, may find a pacific and lasting solution of the differences which may arise between them, persuaded as we are that there exists in reality no cause for conflict, but that the common interests of commerce, industry, agriculture, and of public life as a whole imperatively demand that peace and friendly relations reign between the two nations."

Anti-American Feeling in China. The evil effects of our Chinese exclusion law are likely to continue for a long time and to prove a source of much trouble. They cannot be cured by a reprimand or two administered by President Roosevelt to officials who have been brutally literal in their practical interpretation of the law. They are of too long standing and have taken root too deeply in the Chinese mind to be thus lightly remedied. Rev. Arthur Smith, a missionary who has just returned from China, is reported to have said, at Oakland, Cal.:

"The strong anti-foreign feeling in China is due in large part to the defeat of Russia by Japan. The Chinese are awakening to the fact that they are not a subject people. The feeling against the United States is very bitter because of the exclusion act. This feeling is heightened by imaginary wrongs and exaggerated descriptions of indignities heaped on Chinese in this country, as sent home by Chinese in the United States. But China as a whole has come to a belief that it is easier and cheaper to carry on a negative war against the United States than to attack missions and kill missionaries. The country has learned that where there is no violence there is no punishment to follow. This

feeling is confined to the coast cities, however, and I do not believe that it would be safe for an American to venture into the interior provinces. What the most intelligent of the Chinese want is that the exclusion act shall be intelligently interpreted and shall be enforced only against those classes whom it is meant to affect."

The intelligent interpretation of the exclusion act, of which Mr. Smith speaks, may seemingly be all that is wanted by the most intelligent of the Chinese, and might possibly satisfy them. But nothing short of the abrogation of the act and the putting of the Chinese on the same level as the people of other countries under our immigration laws will ever satisfy the demands of right and justice in the matter. The Chinese will insist on receiving this much of us before they cease their "negative war" against us. And we shall come off well if the boycott is the only instrument that an awakened China shall use against us.

School Debates on Peace. One of the most encouraging signs of the times in regard to the progress of the international arbitration and peace movement is the widespread and growing interest in the subject among the students in the colleges and high schools of the country. Orations, essays and debates on this subject in these institutions have become a part of the settled order. A fine example of these occurred recently at Monrovia, Cal., where a debate was held between the high school of the place and that of the neighboring town of Downey, the contest being for the banner of the Southern California Debating League. The question was: "Resolved, That the United States should build and maintain a great navy." Downey was offered the choice, and took the affirmative. Monrovia had what the school principal and the local newspapers declared to be the wrong and unpopular side, and thus had, apparently, a poor chance. The school auditorium was packed, a special train having come from Downey with their "team" and more than a hundred of their friends, with colors and banners flying. The Monrovia school was represented in the debate by Miss Gladys Burr and Charles Jernegan; Downey, by Miss Lena Evans and Marshall Henshaw,—all bright young folks. The judges were the president of the Los Angeles Normal School, the dean of the University of Southern California and the dean of Occidental College. So strong and convincing were the arguments put up by Monrovia against the building of a great navy that the judges, after three minutes of consultation and comparing notes, rendered a unanimous decision in their favor. We feel sorry for the beaten team, but their defeat will do them good; they will next time, we hope, choose the right side of the question. If other school debaters in California against the insane policy of the United States building

up and maintaining a great navy, which has a strange hold on the Pacific slope dwellers, wish to know how the Monrovia "team" did it, let them call on or write to our friend and co-worker, L. A. Maynard, who is this winter living at Monrovia, and he will let them into the secret.

The Girl Bucket Brigade.

J. W. Leeds sends us the following recent item of Philadelphia local news. It serves as an excellent practical illustration of one of the useful and unobjectionable methods of drill, without warlike weapons (such as those used by Boys' Brigades), which the opponents of war during late years have recommended. The account is from the *Public Ledger*:

A bucket brigade composed of young women yesterday saved the Industrial Home for Jewish Girls, at 6003 Lombard Street. Fire had got a good start in the main hallway shortly before noon. The twelve girls living in the home were taking part in a Bible reading in the lower class room. One of them left the room on an errand and on her way back saw smoke curling up from the floor near.

"Fire, fire!" she cried, as she ran into the class room.

The matron, Jennie Somet, and the Bible class teacher, Edna Goff, kept their heads and calmed the young woman, who had become panic-stricken. Then Mrs. Somet led her charges to the kitchen, gave each a bucket of water, and an attack on the flames was begun. The blaze had been caused by an overheated flue.

John Bottomly, a neighbor, having heard the cries of the girls, ran to their assistance and did good work with a garden hose. But credit for saving the building must be given to the bucket brigade.

New York Peace Society.

A general New York Peace Society now seems assured. On January 15 a call for a meeting to consider the subject was sent out signed by some twenty persons interested in the cause. Among them were Hon. Samuel J. Barrows, Cephas Brainerd, Prof. John B. Clark, Miss Ellen Collins, Cleveland H. Dodge, Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, Dr. H. M. Leipziger, Walter S. Logan, Chancellor MacCracken and Dr. Josiah Strong. In response to the invitation more than forty persons gathered at the Broadway Tabernacle Church on Tuesday, January 23, to consider the advisability of forming a society. A number of other persons who could not attend sent letters expressing their interest. Telegrams of greeting were received from the Directors of the American Peace Society, then in session, and from Andrew Carnegie, who was absent from the city. Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D. D., presided. After discussion a committee was appointed, consisting of Cephas Brainerd, Prof. Charles Sprague Smith, Prof. Samuel T. Dutton, Rev. Charles E. Jefferson and Dr. Ernst Richard, to work out a

constitution, propose a name for the Society, etc. In opening the meeting Dr. Ernst Richard of Columbia University, who had been active in calling the meeting, expressed the hope that New York City might have, as she ought to have, a great peace society through which a vigorous campaign of education might be carried on, both for the winning of general public opinion, and especially for the training of the young in right ideas. We shall watch with profound interest the movement thus inaugurated in New York City, which was the seat of the first peace society ever created (August, 1815), and shall hope that "The New York Arbitration and Peace Society" — for such it might well be called — may have, in the splendid field open to it, a long and eminently useful life.

Anti-militarism in Workingmen.

The steadily growing opposition of the workingmen of Europe to the prevailing militarism and its increasing burdens is illustrated by a new anti-militarist poster in France, upon which the *Journal des Débats* comments as follows:

"The General Confederation of Labor has gotten out a new manifesto against militarism, which is to be posted up all over France and distributed through the agency of the Labor Bourses. The purpose of this manifesto is to persuade workingmen not to respond to the call in case of war. It has been drawn up with a certain prudence, inspired, doubtless, by the recent verdict of the 'Court of Assizes.' Mr. Hervé is not named. The words desertion and rebellion are avoided. Advice to take advantage of foreign war in order to stir up civil war is not expressed. There is no suggestion of getting rid of the officers by means of a few stray bullets. The authors of the poster insist that the German proletariat will adopt the same tactics as those of France, so that war will become practically impossible and its horrors be spared to both countries. . . . Finally, no signatures are attached to the compromising document."

This poster, the contents of which the *Journal des Débats* analyzes with some solicitude, and whose purpose it declares must be combatted energetically in the interests of "patriotism," etc., is of immense significance as indicative of the growing purpose of the classes in all countries on whom the cruelties and burdens of war fall most heavily to make it at the earliest practicable moment impossible. They have gotten so far now as to feel the full force of their united power, and this they will use — there is not the least doubt of it — at no distant day to paralyze and kill war, if it is not abolished by other means.

Brevities.

. . . General Nelson A. Miles, inspector-general, has recommended that the Massachusetts militia force be reduced in numbers, as he considers its aggregate strength larger than is required.